

Incident Management Team Performance Evaluation			
Team IC	Mike Morcom	Incident Type	Type 1 Fire
Incident Name	Barry Point Fire	Incident Number	OR-FWF-120680
Assignment Dates	8/15/2012 – 8/24/2012	Total Acres	94,000
Host Agency	USFS	Evaluation Date	23 August 2012
Administrative Unit	FWF MDF	Sub-Unit	Lakeview and Devils Garden RD
<p>At the conclusion of each incident management team (IMT) assignment, the agency administrator or representative should complete this initial performance evaluation (sections 1 - 5). This evaluation should be discussed directly with the incident commander. The initial performance evaluation should be delivered by the agency administrator without delay to the incident commander, the state/regional fire management officer, and the chair of the IMT's home geographic area multi-agency coordination group to ensure prompt follow-up to any issues of concern.</p>			
<p align="center">Complete the follow evaluation narratives and rating for each question 0 - did not achieve expectations, 3 - met expectations, 5 - excelled</p>			
<p>1. How well did the Team accomplish the objectives described in the Wildland Fire Decision Support System (WFDSS) the Delegation of Authority, and the Agency Administrator Briefing?</p>			
Circle one	0	1	2
			3
			4
			5
(Explain)			
<p>3.5 – The team accomplished the objectives that were laid out for them and exceeded the expectations of the Agency Administrators.</p>			
<p>2. How well did the Team manage the cost of the incident? Did the team follow agency incident operating guidelines? Were follow-up issues identified and documented for the Agency Administrator ie; invoices, OWCP and vendor issues?</p>			
Circle one	0	1	2
			3
			4
			5
(Explain)			
<p>3 – The team managed the cost of the incident, followed incident operating guidelines. They kept the Agency Administrators apprised of issues as they developed and were able to follow up as needed.</p>			

3. How did the Team demonstrate sensitivity to resource limits/constraints and environmental concerns?						
Circle one	0	1	2	3	4	5
(Explain)						
4 – The team was responsive to resource limits and constraints, sensitive to environmental concerns. They worked well with the Resource Advisor and Field Observers, ensuring that concerns were documented and addressed in a timely manner. They were sensitive to overloading the local unit and depleting resources at the local level.						
4. How well did the Team deal with sensitive political and social concerns?						
Circle one	0	1	2	3	4	5
(Explain)						
4 – The Team accommodated requests from land owners, worked with local cooperators and entities to ensure smooth operations. They were sensitive to the political and social concerns. Meetings and interactions with cooperators and land owners on the Modoc were well managed.						
5. Was the Team professional in the manner in which they assumed management of the incident and how they managed the total incident? How did the Team handle transition either to another IMT or in returning the incident the hosting agency?						
Circle one	0	1	2	3	4	5
(Explain)						
3- The Agency Administrators had high expectations for professionalism from this team. These expectations were well met.						
6. How well did the Team anticipate and respond to changing conditions, was the response timely and effective?						
Circle one	0	1	2	3	4	5
(Explain)						
3.5 – The team met expectations in response to sometimes rapidly changing conditions. Their response to the spread of the fire to the SE was timely and effective.						
7. How well did the Team place the proper emphasis on safety?						
Circle one	0	1	2	3	4	5
(Explain)						
3.5 - Good safety record but there were opportunities for things to go badly especially with private landowners and permittees. There is a need to make sure that everyone is communicating. Safety officers were tied into operations. Safety officer trainee exhibited good leadership and attention to detail. We appreciate the use of the Risk Management Matrix, updating it daily, and keeping track of appropriate mitigations. We appreciate that the team tied in with and used the local Forest Safety Officer.						

8. Did the Team activate and manage the mobilization/demobilization in a timely and cost effective manner?

Circle one

0

1

2

3

4

5

(Explain)

3 – The Agency Administrators had high expectations for the team and they met them. Mobilization and demobilization was conducted and accomplished in a timely and cost effective manner. They did not draw out the assignment but evaluated the factors leading to transition and demob.

9. How well did the Team use local resources, trainees, and closest available forces?

Circle one

0

1

2

3

4

5

(Explain)

4 - The AA specifically requested during the in briefing that the Team utilize local trainees within the SCOFMP area. The Team was provided a list of local trainees and they brought a lot of local folks into it. The team was openly receptive to using trainees throughout the organization. The local IA engines floated in and out very smoothly to support the suppression efforts while still being available for local IA.

10. How did the Team notify the incident agency regarding triggers for initiating a cost share agreement or large fire cost review? How were those recommendations implemented?

Circle one

0

1

2

3

4

5

(Explain)

N/A - The Cost Share Agreement was in place when this team arrived. Finance helped with wording to ensure that the existing cost share agreement would be implemented and tracked. .

11. Was the IC engaged and in charge of the Team and the Incident? How well did the IC function and operate as a leader?

Circle one

0

1

2

3

4

5

(Explain)

4- The IC relates well with his troops and was engaged at every level of the organization.

12. How timely was the IC in assuming responsibility for the incident and initiating action?						
Circle one	0	1	2	3	4	5
(Explain)						
4 - The IC was timely upon arrival in assuming responsibility for the incident and initiating action. The IC did not have a full shadow day prior to assuming responsibility for the incident and initiating action.						
13. How did the IC show sincere concern and empathy for the hosting unit and local conditions?						
Circle one	0	1	2	3	4	5
(Explain)						
5 - The IC was responsive to the landowners concerns and emphasized the importance of local conditions during briefing etc. The IC came in with a positive attitude and was responsive to the needs of the local unit and community. He listened well, was not defensive, and showed a lot of empathy toward landowners and permittees. He did not minimize concerns but treated them all equally.						
14. Did the Incident Management Team provide an organized financial package (comps/claims documentation completed, payment documents forwarded, I- suite updated, etc.) to the host unit or next IMT prior to demobilization?						
Circle one	0	1	2	3	4	5
(Explain)						
4- The Financial Package was very well organized and the incoming Team will get a comprehensive and complete package. The Finance team has offered to stay for a couple of days to ensure smooth transition with the Type 3 team. The local unit put together a strong package in the early days that was passed on to each subsequent team.						
15. Other comments:						
The Agency Administrators had high expectations of this team. The team met or exceeded these expectations by working effectively with two Regions, two National Forests, numerous state and local entities, and various policies and procedures.						
Agency Administrator or Representative:	Fred Wray, Forest Sup. Fire-WCU GREG PITTMAN Dist. Forester ODF KIMBERLY H ANDERSON FOREST SUPERVISOR - NADOC NF			Date:	23 August 2012 8-23-12 8-23-12	
Incident Commander:	PNW2 IC			Date:	8/25/12	